

Personality Traits, Organizational and Operational Police Stress in the Ethiopian Federal Police: A Correlational Cross Sectional Study

Tamirat Mulugeta Bekele¹ & Dr. Teka Zewdie Mengesha²

¹ Lecturer, Ethiopian Police University, Doctoral Candidate, School of Psychology, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia,

² Associate Professor, School of Psychology, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia,

Abstract

Problem: There are few studies worldwide that tried to investigate a relationship between personality and police stress. These studies reported significant relationship among personality traits and police stress. However, most of the studies are conducted in western context, and there are few studies conducted in African setting that show the pattern of relationship among personality traits and police stress. This study therefore, aimed to assess the relationship personally has with police occupational stress in the Ethiopian context. **Approach:** A cross-sectional correlational method was employed in this study. Using a stratified sampling technique, 401, police officers, of which 22.9% are females, were selected and completed the survey. Police Stress Questionnaire and the Neuroticism-Extraversion-Openness Five-Factor Inventory were used to collect data. **Findings:** Officers in the Ethiopian Federal Police Commission experienced a high level of occupational stress, where organizational stress ($M=3.99$) is found to be higher than operational stress ($M=3.88$). Neuroticism was found to have a significant positive correlation with organizational and operational police stress ($r=.163$ and $.196$) respectively. Similarly, significant positive the relationship was observed between agreeableness and police organizational stress ($r=.316$) and police operational stress ($r=.226$). Conscientiousness was also found to have a significant positive association with organizational police stress ($.279$) and police operational stress ($.179$). Organizational police stress was also found to have a significant negative association with extroversion and openness ($r=-.137$ and $-.160$) respectively. Extroversion and openness did not have a significant association with operational police stress. The regression analysis showed that four of the personality traits (neuroticism, extroversion, agreeableness and conscientiousness) significantly predicted both police organizational and operational stress, but not openness. **Conclusion:** It can be concluded that personality traits are significant predictors of police organizational and operational stress in the Ethiopian Federal Police. Police organizations should work towards understanding the relationship among personality traits and occupational stress, consider personality types on recruitment and assign police officers to tasks fit their personalities so that to increase performance and serve the public in a better way.

Keywords: Organizational Police Stress, Operational Police stress, Big Five Personality Traits, Ethiopian Police

Introduction

Numerous studies in the field of police consistently indicate that police work is dangerous and highly stressful and leads to physiological, emotional, and social consequences [1–6]. Research also suggests that police officers show a higher level of occupational stress compared to other professionals [7, 8]. In testifying to this, a study by Johnson et al. [9] found out that police are one of the six professions that have a high level of stress. There are many factors that contribute to a high level of stress in the police force. First, policing is highly stressful because there are rigid and unresponsive organizational structures; second, it is required from police officers to function effectively in any kind of danger; third, they have to deal with any type of misery like child abuse, rape, instantaneous life or death decisions, and most importantly, dealing with the attitude and expectations of the public. In a nutshell, daily police work is full of challenges and risks, which result in a high level of stress.

Police stress is generally categorized into two classifications: organizational and operational [10]. Organizational police stress refers to the stress that emanates from internal characteristics of the organization and relationships with others. These include job demands, job insecurity, reduced equipment, inadequate supervision, lack of support, insufficient pay, excessive paperwork, inactivity, bureaucracy, and the public's perception of police work [10–14]. Operational stress on the other side is stress associated with inherent police work such as traumatic work exposures, use of force, making decisions in critical situations, risks to own safety and that of colleagues, attending the scenes of fatal accidents and injuries, exposure to suffering and violence, shift work, overtime hours, court appearances, danger, and interaction with the public while performing duties like crime prevention, crime investigations, patrol activities, traffic control, and community services [10, 11, 14, 15].

There is evidence in the literature that shows a relationship between the Big Five personality traits and occupational stress, though it is limited in number. The big five personality traits are conventionally labeled as neuroticism, extroversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. In a very brief description, neuroticism is the tendency towards expressing anxiety, anger, depression, and other similar negative affects, whereas extraversion is manifested by sociability, vigor, and an optimistic state of mind. On the other hand, openness is characterized by objectivity, a need for variety, and curiosity, and agreeableness is a tendency towards humanity, conviction, and compassion. Finally, conscientiousness is characterized by self-discipline, order, consistency, and insightfulness [16–21]. Mills & Huebner [22] found a significant relationship between stress, neuroticism, and introversion. Another study by Cano-Garcia et al. [23] showed that stress has a significant association with neuroticism and extroversion. Additionally, high neuroticism has been found to have a higher risk of burnout and physical illness, whereas high extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness have been found to have a lower risk of stress and burnout [21, 24, 25, 26].

Fewer studies are conducted to examine the role of the Big Five personality traits in police stress. For example, Madamet et al. [27] suggested that the personality of police officers

can affect the level of perceived stress. Further, in a study by Garbarino et al. [21], it was found out that police officers with high levels of neuroticism are reported to have high levels of stress. In another piece of research, it is reported that police officers who score higher on neuroticism are vulnerable to stress because they perceive their work as dangerous and threatening [21, 28, 29]. Furthermore, a study by Zellars et al. [20] found that police officers who have a higher level of extraversion tend to avoid stressful situations and incidents. Kaur et al. [30] found out that psychoticism, neuroticism, and extroversion have significant relationships with stress on India (Andhra Pradesh) police. In the same country, India/Goa, Narvekar & D'Cunha [31] found out that officers with high neuroticism had a high level of operational stress. Another study conducted on Norwegian police officers by Lau et al. [32] showed that officers with low neuroticism reported a lower perceived stress level compared to others, whereas officers who scored low extraversion reported higher levels of perceived stress. Louw [33] also found that neuroticism has a significant positive correlation with burnout, whereas agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience show a significant negative association with burnout on South African Police.

To the best knowledge of the researchers, the relationship between personality traits and police stress was not studied in Ethiopia. Therefore, the current study aims to come up with a local perspective on the relationship between the Big Five personality traits and police operational and organizational stress in the Ethiopian Federal Police Commission. The study can also be used as a springboard for other researchers interested in investigating police stress and the relationship between personality traits and stress.

Research questions

- What is the level of organizational and operational police stress in Ethiopian Federal Police Commission?
- Do the Big Five personality traits (Neuroticism, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Openness to experience, and Conscientiousness) significantly associated with organizational and operational police stress?
- Which of the Big Five personality traits (Neuroticism, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Openness to experience, and Conscientiousness) significantly predict police organizational and operational police stress?

Methodology

Research design and participants

This research utilized a correlational cross-sectional survey design and a quantitative approach. A correlational research design was used because it is the best way to investigate the relationship between two or more variables, while a cross-sectional method was employed to study participants and collect data at the same time. The population for this study was the entire population of police officers in the Ethiopian Federal Police Commission. According to Ethiopian Federal Police Commission Establishment Proclamation (Amendment) No. 944/2016

[34], police officer means a member of the Ethiopian Federal Police Commission who has received basic training in the police profession and is employed by the Commission. Two main operational sectors of the Ethiopian Federal Police Commission, namely crime prevention and crime investigation sectors, were selected because one of the dependent variables, operational stress, applies only to crime prevention and crime investigation activities. A total of 401 police officers from the Ethiopian Federal Police Commission participated in this study. They were selected using stratified random sampling. First, the police officers were stratified by their respective work unit (sector). Simple random sampling was employed to select police officers as samples from the two work units (strata).

Instruments

Police stress was measured using the Police Stress Questionnaire. There are two parts to the questionnaire: the Organizational Police Stress Questionnaire (PSQ-Org) and the Operational Police Stress Questionnaire (PSQ-Op). Both questionnaires were developed by McCreary and Thompson [35] with the purpose of measuring stress specific to police. There are 20 items in each questionnaire, and the items are rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 ("not at all stressful" or "no stress at all") to 7 ("very stressful" or "a lot of stress"), with 4 indicating moderate stress. The internal consistency (reliability) of the questionnaires was found to be strong, with Chronbach's alpha for PSQ-Org being .834 and PSQ-Op being .845. Police personality was measured using the Revised NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI). The NEO-FFI is a psychological personality inventory developed by Costa and McCrae [36]. The NEO-FFI was developed to provide a concise measure of the five basic personality factors: neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness, using self-report. The reliability of the personality scales was found to be alpha .687 for neuroticism, .659 for extroversion, .509 for openness to experience, .721 for agreeableness, and .858 for conscientiousness.

Because the official language of the Ethiopian Federal Police Commission is Amharic, the English versions of the Questionnaires were translated into Amharic by two psychologists, whose mother tongue is Amharic, then back-translated by another senior psychologist. After both sides of the translation were completed, the translators, psychologists, and the researchers had a panel session to discuss the differences in the way the items were translated. The questionnaires were also handed to two senior police officers for review to ensure the cultural and contextual appropriateness of each item for the Ethiopian Police setting. This was important because the cultural and organizational conditions in which the questionnaire was first developed might be different from those at the current study site.

Data collection procedure

This study was methodically and ethically approved by the Addis Ababa University School of Psychology Research Ethics Committee. The Self-report questionnaire of the Amharic version of the questionnaire is used to collect data for this study. During the data collection, the officers were asked for their verbal consent to participate in the study, and the researchers explained the purpose of the study and related ethical issues in addition to what was written on

the questionnaire. The data was collected from Ethiopian Federal Police officers working in Addis Ababa, the capital of Ethiopia, and peripheral towns around Addis Ababa.

Data analysis

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (IBM SPSS) version 26 was used to analyze the data in this study. Descriptive statistics was first used to show the broad picture of organizational and operational police stress. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation coefficient was used to see the association between personality traits and organizational and operational stress in the police force. Multiple linear regression analysis was also used to examine the predictive power of personality traits on police organizational and operational stress.

Findings

Demographic characteristics of study participants

Among the participants, 309 (71.1%) were males and 92 (22.9%) were females. The mean age of the participants was 34.58 years (SD = 8.49), with the mean service years of the participants being 13.44 years (SD = 7.72). Concerning the work type of the police department, 294 (73.3%) participants were from the crime prevention department, while the remaining 107 (26.7%) were from the crime investigation sector or department. Rank-wise, 117 (29.2%) of the participants were low-ranked officers (Assistant Sergeant up to Chief Sergeant), 131 (32.7%) were middle-ranked officers (Assistant Inspectors up to Inspectors), 93 (23.2%) were higher-ranked officers (Chief Inspectors up to Commanders), and 60 (15%) were officers with no rank (Constables).

Intensity and Level of Police Stress

Table 1

As indicated in table 1, the mean value of organizational stress was found to be 3.99, with a standard deviation of 2.03, which is rated as a high level of stress. The most stressful organizational component was the feeling that different rules apply to different people (e.g., favoritism) (M = 4.73, SD = 1.92), followed by inconsistent leadership style (M = 4.55, SD = 2.11). Lack of resources (M = 4.49, SD = 2.10) and lack of training on new equipment were also found to be highly stressful for the police officers (M = 5.35, SD = 1.99, M = 4.41, SD = 1.87, respectively). Additionally, Unequal sharing of work responsibilities (M = 4.40, SD = 2.14), Inadequate equipment (M = 4.35, SD = 1.99), and Bureaucratic red tape (M = 4.29, SD = 2.28) were among the most stressful organizational factors. The relatively least rated organizational stressors were perceived pressure to volunteer free time (M = 3.47, SD = 1.96), internal investigations (M = 3.26, SD = 2.08), and dealing with co-workers (M = 2.71, SD = 1.78).

Table 2

According to the cut-off value of PSQ-Op set by McCreary et al. (2017), a mean score of ≤ 2.0 was considered a low-stress level, a mean score of 2.1–3.4 was considered a moderate-stress level, and a mean score of ≥ 3.5 was considered a high-stress level. In this study, the mean score

for the PSQ-op was found to be 3.88 with a standard deviation of 1.98. Based on the cutoff value, this is interpreted as personnel in the Ethiopian Federal Police experiencing a high level of operational stress. The mean score for individual items (stressors) for operational stress ranged from a maximum score of 4.92 for traumatic events like accidents, domestics, death, and injury to a minimum of 2.45 for shift work. Among the 20 items, 9 of them were above the mean score, and these 9 factors were reported to be highly stressful. The highest mean score was obtained on the item that measured traumatic events like accidents, domestics, death, and injury ($M = 4.92$, $SD = 1.91$). Additionally, lack of understanding from family and friends about your work ($M = 4.47$, $SD = 1.92$), negative comments from the public ($M = 4.44$, $SD = 1.89$), and not enough time available to spend with friends and family ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 2.08$) were also found to have high scores, showing social-related issues to be highly stressful. Physical health-related issues were also found to have a high mean score. For instance, the mean value for back pain was 4.39 ($SD = 1.94$), while the mean score for the risk of being injured on the job was 4.21 ($SD = 2.07$). Items ranked as inducing moderate stress were Working alone at night ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 2.09$), work-related activities on days off (e.g., court, community events) ($M = 3.20$, $SD = 2.12$), and shift work ($M = 2.45$, $SD = 1.87$).

Relationship among personality traits and police stress

Table 3

The association between the five personality traits and police organizational and operational stress was assessed. Accordingly, neuroticism was found to have a significant positive correlation ($r(401) = .163$, $p < .001$) with police organizational stress. This shows that police officers with a high level of neuroticism experienced a high level of stress, though the relationship is moderate. Similarly, neuroticism was found to have a moderately significant positive correlation with police operational stress, $r(401) = .196$, $p < .001$, meaning police officers with a high level of neuroticism also experienced a high level of police operational stress.

Agreeableness was also found to have a significant positive correlation with both organizational and operational stress, $r(401) = .326$, $p < .001$ and $r(401) = .226$, $p < .001$ respectively. This means police officers with a high level of agreeableness tended to experience increased organizational and operational stress. Among the other personality traits, conscientiousness was also found to have a significant positive correlation with police organizational stress $r(401) = .279$, $p < .001$ and with police operational stress $r(401) = .174$, $p < .001$, meaning officers with a high level of conscientiousness experienced a higher level of both organizational and operational stress.

On the other hand, extroversion was found to have a weak but significant negative correlation with organizational stress, $r(401) = -.137$, $p < .001$, indicating police officers with a high extroversion trait experienced a low level of stress. The extroversion trait did not show a significant relationship with operational police stress. The trait openness was also found to have a significant negative association with organizational police stress, $r(401) = -.160$, $p < .001$, but no significant association was found between openness and operational police stress.

Table 4

A multiple regression analysis was run to test if the five personality traits significantly predicted police organizational stress. The results of the regression indicated that four of the personality traits (neuroticism, extroversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness) explained 21.2% of the variance in police organizational stress ($R^2 = .23$, $F(5, 395) = 24.87$, $p < .001$). The analysis revealed that neuroticism ($\beta = .199$, $p < .001$), extraversion ($\beta = -.207$, $P < .001$), agreeableness ($\beta = .197$, $P < .001$), and conscientiousness ($\beta = .309$, $P < .001$) significantly predicted the level of organizational stress. Openness did not significantly predict the level of organizational stress.

Table 5

A multiple regression analysis was used again to test if the five personality traits also significantly predicted police operational stress. It was found that the four personality traits (neuroticism, extroversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness) explained 10.9% of the variance ($R^2 = .09$, $F(5, 395) = 9.16$, $p < .001$). Neuroticism significantly predicted police operational stress level ($\beta = .227$, $p < .001$) so did extraversion ($\beta = -.104$, $P = .034$), agreeableness ($\beta = -.104$, $P = .012$) and conscientiousness ($\beta = .221$, $P < .001$). Similar to that of organizational stress, openness did not significantly predict the level of operational stress.

Discussion

The relationship between personality traits and police stress and well-being has been a focus of attention lately, and several studies have tried to establish patterns of police stress and personality traits [21, 32, 37–39]. In the present study, personality characteristics were found to be significant predictors of organizational and operational police stress. Additionally, four of the personality traits (neuroticism, extroversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness) were found to have a significant relationship with police operational and organizational stress. This study revealed that among the five personality traits investigated, neuroticism was found to have a positive association with police stress, meaning police officers with a high level of neuroticism reported high level of stress. This finding aligns with most of the findings in the literature concerning the relationship between neuroticism and occupational stress. For example, Ortega et al. [40] found that neuroticism was positively related to perceived sources of stress; they further suggested that neuroticism was positively associated with feeling tense, uptight, and exhausted, as well as cognitive confusion. Berg et al. [41] also revealed that police officers with high scores on neuroticism traits reported their work to be more stressful than those with extroverted traits. Other researchers on the same topic also revealed that neuroticism is a significant predictor of police stress and has a positive association with police occupational stress [21, 32, 42, 43].

In a very general understanding from the literature, individuals with a high level of neuroticism are vulnerable to poor activities, get easily worried and angered, show tendencies of

melancholy, have difficulties handling pressures, have difficulties controlling their impulses, and are subject to negative affect, which makes them easily susceptible to stress [19–21, 38]. If officers have a high level of neuroticism, it is difficult to cope with stressful situations that they must face daily, as the police profession is highly stressful and full of daily hustles. Additionally, being at risk of emotional instability and irrational thinking exposes officers to a high level of neuroticism and a high level of occupational stress.

There is strong evidence in the literature concerning the relationship between extraversion and police stress. For instance, a study conducted on Jamaican police officers revealed that officers' well-being was strongly predicted by extroversion [42]. Additionally, an early study on Australian police officers showed extroversion as the strongest predictor of stress, alongside neuroticism [43]. In another study by Lau et al. [32], officers with a high extroversion score reported lower levels of perceived stress compared to the others. Other studies also showed that officers with high extroversion traits were less prone to stress [40, 42, 44]. Similarly, the current study showed extroversion as a significant predictor of both operational police stress ($\beta = -.104$, $P = .034$) and organizational police stress ($\beta = -.207$, $P = .000$), meaning officers with a high level of extroversion experienced a low level of stress. A significant negative association was also found between extroversion and organizational police stress ($r = -.137$, $p < .001$), affirming the evidence in the literature. Studies of personality traits indicate that individuals with a high level of extroversion show positivity in social situations, have tendencies toward sociability and vigor, and have an optimistic state of mind [18, 21, 38, 45]. In this sense, officers with a high level of extroversion can handle stressful situations. The tendency to seek social relationships and social contacts helps them to discuss and vent stressful situations, which in turn helps them to overcome and control their situations. Police officers with high extroversion can handle situations and deal with problems related to their job more efficiently than others and, therefore, experience a lower level of stress.

Conscientiousness is characterized by a tendency to control impulses, act in socially acceptable ways, and exhibit goal-directed behavior, like being dependable, organized, responsible, and achievement-oriented [26, 46]. These characteristics are very much needed in the police profession. In policing, a high level of responsibility is required as they deal with highly sensitive issues related to safety, security, and even life-or-death-deciding incidents involving citizens and themselves in their day-to-day activities. Hence, it is generally expected of police officers to exhibit a higher level of conscientiousness; otherwise, it is imminent that they experience a higher level of stress [48]. Literature in the field has supported this claim. For instance, Nelson and Smith [42] revealed that conscientiousness significantly predicted police wellbeing. Lau et al. [32] also revealed that police officers with a high level of conscientiousness reported a low level of occupational stress. The findings of this study affirmed what exists in the literature. It was found that conscientiousness had a significant positive correlation with both organizational ($r = .279$, $p < .001$) and operational ($r = .174$, $p < .001$) police stress. This study also

found that Ethiopian Federal Police officers' organizational and operational stress is significantly predicted by conscientiousness traits.

There is scarce literature on the relationship between agreeableness and police stress, to the knowledge of the researcher, or the researcher could not access the resources. However, literature on occupational stress in other areas showed that agreeableness was negatively correlated with occupational stress. For instance, a study by Mirhaghi and Sarabian [49] on health care professionals revealed a negative correlation between agreeableness and perceived stress. In another study, high agreeableness was found to be associated with lower occupational stress [50]. Further, Asendorpf & Van Aken [51] reported that the positive attitude that highly agreeable people manifest is associated with rare social conflicts and more support from others, which can result in a lower level of stress. According to a general understanding from the literature, policing demands constant interaction with different types of people; hence, creating and maintaining healthy relationships is an important factor in the profession. Agreeable police officers can easily coordinate and cooperate with fellow officers, are sympathetic, avoid conflicts at the workplace, and can perform their duties relatively smoothly, which can increase their performance and decrease their burnout.

The present study, however, found contradictory findings with the existing literature. It is found that agreeableness has a significant positive correlation with both organizational ($r=.316$, $p<.001$) and operational ($r=.226$, $p<.001$) stress, meaning agreeable officers reported a higher level of stress. In the current study situation, when one is agreeable, it is easy to be influenced and manipulated by others, resulting in abusing laws, regulations, and policies. This can result in increased negative internal evaluation, thereby creating stress. Additionally, the relationship they have with the public might allow them to closely understand what the public feels about the police, which is most of the time negative and can also increase stress. In a police setting like Ethiopia, where organizational politics and red tape are high, being agreeable can be related to high stress.

The relationship between openness and police stress is rarely indicated in police stress studies. Among these, Nelson and Smith [42] found that higher levels of openness to experiences were associated with a lower level of stress, though the coefficient is weak. In other areas, too, openness was reported to be negatively associated with stress [50, 52, 53]. In the present study, openness was found to have a significant negative correlation ($r=-.160$, $p<.001$) with organizational stress, confirming the evidence in the literature. However, openness did not significantly predict both types of police stress.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that personality traits are significant predictors of organizational and operational police stress in the Ethiopian Federal Police. Police personnel with neuroticism, agreeableness, and Conscientiousness traits experience more organizational stress than police personnel with extroversion and openness

traits. Similarly, police personnel in the Ethiopian Federal Police with neuroticism, agreeableness, and conscientiousness experience a high level of stress.

References

1. Anshel MH. A conceptual model and implications for coping with stressful events in police work. *Crim. Justice Behav.* 2000;27(3):375–400.
2. Andersen JP, Papazoglou K, Koskelainen M, Nyman M, Gustafsberg H, & Arnetz BB. Applying resilience promotion training among Special Forces police officers. *SAGE Open.* 2015;5(2).
3. Marmar CR, McCaslin SE, Metzler TJ, Best S, Weiss DS, Fagan, et al. Predictors of posttraumatic stress in police and other first responders. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* 2006; 10(7):1–18.
4. Reynolds CA, Wagner SL. (2007). Stress and first responders: the need for a multidimensional approach to stress management. *Int. J. Disabil. Manag.* 2007; 2(2):27–36.
5. Lee HD, Cao L, Kim D, Woo Y. (2019). Police contact and confidence in the police in a medium-sized city. *Int. J. Law Crime Justice.* 2019;(56):70–78.
6. Arble E, Arnetz BB. A model of first-responder coping: an approach/avoidance bifurcation. *Stress Health.* 2017; 33(3):223–232.
7. Russell LM. An empirical investigation of high-risk occupations: Leader influence on employee stress and burnout among police. *Mngt. Research Review.* 2014; 37(4): 367–384.
8. Yun I, Kim SG, Jung S, Borhanian S. A study on police stressors, coping strategies, and somatization symptoms among South Korean frontline police officers. *Policing.* 2013. 37(4):787-802.
9. Johnson S, Cooper C, Cartwright S, Donald I, Taylor P, Millet C. The experience of work-related stress across occupations. *J. Manag. Psychol.* 2005;20(2):178–187.
10. Shane J. Organizational Stressors and Police Performance. *J Crim Justice.* 2010;38(4):807-818.
11. Kop N, Euwema M, Shaufeli W. Burnout, job stress and violent behavior among Dutch police officers. *Work & Stress.* 1999; 13(4): 326–340.
12. Cordner GW. (2013). *Police Administration* (8th ed). Waltham: Anderson Publishing; 2013.
13. Shane JM (2013). Daily work experiences and police performance. *Police Pract. Res.* 2013;14(1):17-34.
14. Violanti JM. *Dying for the Job: Police Work, Exposure and Health.* Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas; 2014.
15. Bonnar AJ. Stress at Work: The Beliefs and Experiences of Police Superintendents. *Int. j. police sci.* 2000;2(4):285–302.

16. McCrae RR, Costa Jr, PT. Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *J Pers Soc Psychol.* 1987;52(1):81-90.
17. McCrae RR, Costa Jr, PT. Adding Liebe und Arbeit: The full five-factor model and well-being. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull.* 1991;17(2):227–232.
18. Costa Jr PT, McCrae RR, Kay GG. Persons, places and personality: Career assessment using the Revised NEO Personality Inventory. *J. Career Assess.* 1995;3(2);123-139.
19. Costa Jr PT, McCrae RR. Overview: Innovations in assessment using the revised NEO personality inventory. *Assessment.* 2000;7(4):325-327.
20. Zellars KL, Perrew PL, Hochwarter WA. Burnout in Health Care: The Role of the Five Factors of Personality. *Appl. Soc. Psychol.* 2000;30:1570-1598.
21. Garbarino S, Cuomo G, Chiorri C, Magnavita N. Association of work-related stress with mental health problems in a special police force unit. *BMJ Open.* 2013;3(7).
22. Mills LB, Huebner ES. (1998). A prospective study of personality characteristics, occupational stressors, and burnout among school psychology practitioners. *J Sch Psychol.* 1998;36(1):103–120.
23. Cano-Garcia FJ, Padilla-Muñoz EM, Carrasco-Ortiz MÁ. Personality and contextual variables in teacher burnout. *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 2005; 38: 929–940. Doi:
24. Judge T, Heller D, Mount M. Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *J Appl Psychol.* 2000; 87(3):530–541. Doi:10.1037//0021 9010.87.3.530
25. Grant S, Langan-Fox J. Personality and the occupational stressor-strain relationship: The role of the big five. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* 2007;12(1):20–33.
26. Alarcon G, Eschleman, Bowling N. Relationships between personality variables and burnout: A meta-analysis. *Work and Stress.* 2009;23(3):244-263.
27. Madamet A, Potard C, Huart I, ElHage W, Courtois R. Relationship between the big five personality traits and PTSD among French police officers. *Eur. J. Trauma Dissociation.* 2018; 2(2): 83–89.
28. Barrick MR, Mount MK. Yes, Personality Matters: Moving on to More Important Matters. *Human Performance.* 2005;18(4):359.
29. Burbeck E, Furnham A. Personality and police selection: Trait differences in successful and non-successful applicants to the metropolitan police. *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 1984; 5(3):257–263.
30. Kaur R, Chodagiri VK, Reddi NK. (2013). A psychological study of stress, personality and coping in police personnel. *Indian J. Psychol. Med.* 2013;23(2):141- 147.
31. Narvekar HN, D’Cunha T. Operational Stress Levels and Adjustment-Neuroticism among Police Personnel in Goa. *Police Crim Psych.* 2021; 36:159–169.
32. Lau B, Hem E. Berg AM, Ekeberg Ø, Torgersen S. Personality types, coping, and stress in the Norwegian police service. *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 2006;41: 971-982.
33. Louw, GJ. Burnout, vigour, big five personality traits and social support in a sample of police officers. *SA J. Ind. Psychol.* 2014;40:1-13. Doi:10.4102/SAJIP.V40I1.1119.

34. Ethiopian Federal Police Commission Establishment Proclamation (Amendment) No. 944/2016
35. McCreary DR, Thompson MM. Development of two reliable and valid measures of stressors in policing: The Operational and Organizational Police Stress Questionnaires. *Int. J. Stress Manag.* 2006;13(4):494-518.
36. McCrae R, Costa P. More Reasons to Adopt the Five-Factor Model. *American Psychologist.* 1989;44:451-452.
37. Lawrence RA. Police stress and personality factors: A conceptual model. *J Crim Justice.* 1984;12(3):247-263.
38. Connolly JJ, Viswesvaran C. The role of affectivity in job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 2000;29(2):265–281.
39. Collins PA, Gibbs AC. Stress in police officers: a study of the origins, prevalence and severity of stress-related symptoms within a county police force. *Occup. Med.* 2003;53(4):256-64.
40. Ortega A, Brenner SO, Leather P. Occupational Stress, Coping and Personality in the police: An SEM study. *Int. j. police sci. manag.* 2007;9(1):36-50.
41. Berg AM, Hem E, Lau B, Håseth K, Ekeberg Ø. Stress in the Norwegian police service. *Occup. Med.* 2006; 55(2):113-120.
42. Nelson KV, Smith AP. Occupational stress, coping and mental health in Jamaican police officers. *Occup. Med.* 2016;66:488–491.
43. Hart MP, Wearing JA, Headey B. Police stress and well-being: Integrating personality, coping and daily work experiences. *J Occup Organ Psychol.* 1995;68(2):133-156.
44. Hart P, Cotton P. *Conventional Wisdom is Often Misleading: Police Stress within an Organizational Health Framework.* London: Taylor & Francis; 2003.
45. Khizar U. *The Relationship of Personality Traits, Gender, Occupational Stress and Job Satisfaction among Police Officers in Punjab, Pakistan.* University Utara, Malaysia. 2017; Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.
46. Hayes N, Joseph S. Big 5 correlates of three measures of subjective well-being. *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 2003;34(4):723–727.
47. John OP, Srivastava S. Handbook of personality: Theory and research. In: Pervin LA, O. P. John OP. (eds.). *The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives.* New York: Guilford Press; 1999. Vol. 2, p. 102–138.
48. Howard WG, Howard-Donofrio H, Boles JS. Inter-domain work-family, family-work conflict and police work satisfaction. *Policing: Int. j. police sci. manag.* 2004;27:380-395.
49. Mirhaghi M, Sarabian S. Relationship between perceived stress and personality traits in emergency medical personnel. *Q. J. Fundam. Mental Health.* 2016;18(5): 265-71.
50. Törnroos M. (2015). *Personality and Work Stress: The Role of Five-Factor Model Traits and Cynicism in Perceptions of Work Characteristics.* University of Helsinki, Finland. 2015; Unpublished Dissertation.

51. Asendorpf JB, van Aken MA. Personality-relationship transaction in adolescence: core versus surface personality characteristics. *J Pers.* 2003;71(4):629–666.
52. Williams P, Rau H, Cribbet M, Gunn H. (2009). Openness to Experience and stress regulation. *J. Res. Pers.* 2009;43:777-784.
53. Pollak A, Dobrowolska M, Timofiejczuk A, Paliga M. The Effects of the Big Five Personality Traits on Stress among Robot Programming Students. *Sustainability.* 2020;12(12):5196.

Table 1. Descriptive Summary of the level of Organizational Stress

Items	Mean	SD
The feeling that different rules apply to different people (e.g. favoritism)	4.73	1.92
Inconsistent leadership style	4.55	2.11
Lack of resources	4.49	2.10
Lack of training on new equipment	4.41	1.87
Unequal sharing of work responsibilities	4.40	2.14
Inadequate equipment	4.35	1.99
Bureaucratic red tape	4.29	2.28
Leaders over-emphasize the negatives (e.g. supervisor evaluations, public complaints)	4.28	2.02
Staff shortages	4.26	2.06
Excessive administrative duties	4.18	1.92
Feeling like you always have to prove yourself to the organization	4.09	1.76
Constant changes in policy / legislation	4.02	2.40
Dealing with supervisors	3.66	2.14
Dealing the court system	3.57	1.92
Too much computer work	3.57	1.98
The need to be accountable for doing your job	3.52	2.12
Perceived pressure to volunteer free time	3.47	1.96
Internal investigations	3.26	2.08
Dealing with co-workers	2.71	1.78
Total	3.99	2.03

SD= Standard deviation

Table 2. Descriptive Summary of the Level of Operational Stress

Items	Mean	SD
Traumatic events (e.g. MVA, domestics, death, injury)	4.92	1.91
Lack of understanding from family and friends about your work	4.47	1.92
Negative comments from the public	4.44	1.89
Occupation-related health issues (e.g. back pain)	4.39	1.94
Risk of being injured on the job	4.21	2.07
Not enough time available to spend with friends and family	4.17	2.08
Managing your social life outside of work	4.04	2.09
Friends / family feel the effects of the stigma associated with your job	4.03	1.98
Over-time demands	3.89	1.88
Eating healthy at work	3.79	2.10
Upholding a "higher image" in public	3.72	2.16
Making friends outside the job	3.69	1.89
Feeling like you are always on the job	3.68	1.87
Limitations to your social life (e.g. who your friends are, where you socialize)	3.61	1.94
Paperwork	3.58	1.92
Working alone at night	3.50	2.09
Work related activities on days off (e.g. court, community events)	3.20	2.12
Shift work	2.45	1.87
Total	3.88	1.98

SD= Standard deviation

Table 3. Relationship among Personality Traits and Police Organizational and Operational Stress

	Variables (n=401)	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Neuroticism	24.84	6.20	-						
2	Extroversion	20.58	4.43	.040	-					
3	Openness	24.98	5.01	-.046	.202**	-				
4	Agreeableness	21.59	6.74	.257**	.030	.148*	-			
5	Conscientiousness	28.41	7.36	-.298**	.185**	.319**	.207**	-		
6	Organizational Stress	75.81	20.42	.163**	-.137**	-.160**	.316**	.279**	-	
7	Operational Stress	69.76	18.16	.196**	-.059	.095	.226**	.174**	.682**	-

**P<.01; *p<.05

Table 4. Summary of Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Police Organizational Stress

	Organizational Stress			
	B	SE B	β	Sig.
Neuroticism	.653	.163	.199	.000
Extroversion	-.952	.211	-.207	.000
Openness	.314	.194	.077	.107
Agreeableness	.595	.146	.197	.000
Conscientiousness	.857	.143	.309	.000
F	22.41			.000
ΔR^2	.212			

Table 5. Summary of Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Police Operational Stress

	Operational Stress			
	B	SE B	β	Sig.
Neuroticism	.666	.155	.227	.000
Extroversion	-.425	.200	-.104	.034
Openness	.126	.185	.035	.496
Agreeableness	.364	.145	.135	.012
Conscientiousness	.547	.136	.221	.000
F	9.16			.000
ΔR^2	.109			